

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

Debra Paolini,

Plaintiff,

v.

Rosenthal, Morgan and Thomas, Inc.; and
DOES 1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.

:
:
: Civil Action No.: 1:13-cv-10147
:
:
:

: **FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**
:
:
:
:

For this First Amended Complaint, the Plaintiff, Debra Paolini, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendants and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.

2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Debra Paolini ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in East Boston, Massachusetts, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

5. Defendant Rosenthal, Morgan and Thomas, Inc. (“RMT”), is a Missouri business entity with an address of 12747 Olive Blvd. Suite 375, St. Louis, Missouri 63141, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

6. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by RMT and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. RMT at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

8. The Plaintiff allegedly incurred a financial obligation in the approximate amount of \$300.00 (the “Debt”) to an original creditor (the “Creditor”).

9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to RMT for collection, or RMT was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. RMT Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

12. Within the last year, Defendants contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt.

13. During the initial communication and during each communication thereafter, Plaintiff informed Defendants that she was unemployed and could not pay the Debt.

14. Despite the foregoing, Defendants continued to place numerous calls to Plaintiff in excess of 2 calls per week, violating 940 CMR § 7.04(1)(f), which prohibits Defendants from placing more than two calls in each seven-day period to Plaintiff; and by virtue violating FDCPA.

15. Additionally, Defendants began placing daily calls to Plaintiff's mother asking to speak to Plaintiff, even though Defendants had a correct telephone number for Plaintiff.

16. On many occasions, Plaintiff told Defendants that their daily calls disturbed her 70-year-old mother and demanded that Defendants cease calls to her.

17. In response, Defendants falsely stated that Plaintiff's mother was listed as a reference on Plaintiff's account and continued to harass Plaintiff's mother with daily calls in excess of 2 calls per seven-day period in violation of 940 CMR 7.04(1)(f).

18. Plaintiff has not put her mother as a reference when creating the Debt.

19. Defendants used intimidating tone when speaking with Plaintiff, in one instance screaming at Plaintiff: "I don't care where you get [money]. It has to be paid!"

20. Moreover, Defendants threatened to file a lawsuit against Plaintiff if she failed to pay the Debt. To date, no such action has been commenced.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

21. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.

22. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

23. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(b) in that Defendants communicated with individuals other than the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff's attorney, or a credit bureau.

25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.

26. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(2) in that Defendants used abusive language when speaking with the consumer.

27. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.

28. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e in that Defendants used false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of a debt.

29. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(5) in that Defendants threatened to take legal action, without actually intending to do so.

30. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) in that Defendants employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt.

31. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f in that Defendants used unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt.

32. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

33. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

COUNT II
INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION

34. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

35. The Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, "One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person."

36. Massachusetts further recognizes the Plaintiff's right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus Defendant violated Massachusetts state law.

37. The Defendant intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff's right to privacy by continually harassing the Plaintiff with numerous calls.

38. The conduct of the Defendant in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

39. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from Defendant.

40. All acts of Defendant and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendant is subject to punitive damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against Defendants;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against Defendants;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against Defendants;
4. Actual damages from Defendants for the all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
5. Punitive damages; and
6. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: May 24, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Sergei Lemberg

Sergei Lemberg (BBO# 650671)
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (203) 653-3424
Attorneys for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this the 24th of May, 2013, the foregoing was filed with the clerk of the Court through the CM/ECF system (ECF) and that the document is available on ECF.

/s/ Sergei Lemberg

Sergei Lemberg